UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

_

STATE OF NEVADA, NDOC, NDOC'S EMPLOYEES, et al.,

VICTOR TAGLE,

Defendants.

Plaintiff,

2:15-cv-01402-JAD-VCF

ORDER

MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME TO RESPOND [ECF No. 187]

Before the Court is Defendants' Motion for Enlargement of Time to Respond to Plaintiff's Filings at ECF Nos. 182, 183, and 184. (ECF No. 187). For the reasons discussed below, the motion is granted.

Responses to Plaintiff's filings were due on October 15, 2018. On that date, Defendants filed a motion for enlargement of time. (ECF No. 187). Defendants ask for a one-week extension to file their responses. (*Id.* at 2-3).

"When an act may or must be done within a specified time, the court may, for good cause, extend the time." Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1); *see also* LR IA 6-1. "Good cause exists to enlarge the time by which a party may file a brief where additional time is needed to prepare such a brief." *Olivas v. Nevada ex rel. Dep't of Corr.*, No. 2:14-cv-01801-JCM-VCF, 2017 WL 3484650, at *1 (D. Nev. Aug. 14, 2017).

The Court finds good cause to extend the time for Defendants to respond to Plaintiff's motions.¹ Plaintiff has filed several motions within a short amount of time, explaining Defendants' request for a minor extension of time to respond.

¹ The Court is ruling on the motion for extension of time before the time to respond to the motion has expired. Defendants are asking for a one-week extension, whereas the deadline to respond to the motion to extend time is two weeks.

J

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendants' Motion for Enlargement of Time to Respond to Plaintiff's Filings at ECF Nos. 182, 183, and 184 (ECF No. 187) is GRANTED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants will have until October 22, 2018 to file a response to ECF Nos. 182, 183, and 184.

NOTICE

Pursuant to Local Rules IB 3-1 and IB 3-2, a party may object to orders and reports and recommendations issued by the magistrate judge. Objections must be in writing and filed with the Clerk of the Court within fourteen days. LR IB 3-1, 3-2. The Supreme Court has held that the courts of appeal may determine that an appeal has been waived due to the failure to file objections within the specified time. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 142 (1985). This circuit has also held that (1) failure to file objections within the specified time and (2) failure to properly address and brief the objectionable issues waives the right to appeal the District Court's order and/or appeal factual issues from the order of the District Court. *Martinez v. Ylst*, 951 F.2d 1153, 1157 (9th Cir. 1991); *Britt v. Simi Valley United Sch. Dist.*, 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983).

Pursuant to Local Special Rule 2-2, the Plaintiff must immediately file written notification with the court of any change of address. The notification must include proof of service upon each opposing party of the party's attorney. **Failure to comply with this Rule may result in dismissal of the action**. *See* LSR 2-2.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 16th day of October, 2018.

CAM FERENBACH

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE